

bill would make these problems even worse.

A majority of the public says they don't want future elections to look like the last one—special situation, a pandemic. They don't want future elections to look like the last one. The American people want security, and they want integrity. We want to trust that our elections are fair.

That is why I have joined Senator SCOTT of Florida, Senator HYDE-SMITH, and Senator LUMMIS to introduce a bill specifically to give people more confidence in our elections. It is called the Save Democracy Act. Our bill bans vote harvesting. It bans automatic registration. It requires at least a Social Security number to register to vote.

Under our bill, States can't just send out ballots in the mail based on old information. People could still vote by mail, as they do in my home State of Wyoming; they would just need to request a ballot. They wouldn't get a ballot automatically in the mail; they would have to request a ballot so that we know their information is up-to-date. These are the kind of common-sense protections that our elections need. Our bill makes it actually harder to cheat, not easier. The Democrat's bill makes it easier to cheat.

At a time like this, when prices are too high, hiring is too low, the U.S. Senate has important work to do, the things that we hear about when we go home on weekends: What does it cost for gas? What does it cost for groceries? What does it cost to fill up your car?

The American people want us to work on these bread-and-butter issues that affect their daily lives. They don't want this partisan power grab that is going to be voted on in the Senate next week. They also don't want the Senate wasting time on bills that cannot pass.

It is time for the Democrats and the Democratic leader to focus on what the American people are asking us to focus on: bring down inflation, stop paying people more to not work than they would make if they were working, secure our southern border, and leave our elections alone. That is what I hear at home, and I know that many of the Members are hearing the exact same thing as we work here to focus on what should be the future of a better, more prosperous America, not a one-sided America, with a domination of elections based on a law to make it easier to cheat.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is no secret that this Senator has been a leader in promoting renewable energy sources. Iowa has done even more to lead the Nation in biofuels production. This leads to a cleaner environment and really increases America's energy independence.

Last week, Reuters reported the Biden administration is considering ways to allow U.S. oil refiners to not meet their biofuel blending requirements. This same administration has proposed hundreds of billions of dollars in subsidies for electric vehicles but failed to include any support for biofuels infrastructure, which play a vital role in our Nation's transportation sector as well as our efforts to reduce greenhouse gases.

Need I remind my colleagues, President Biden promised in his campaign to "promote and advance renewable energy, ethanol, and other biofuels to help rural America and our nation's farmers." President Biden is not keeping that promise.

Unfortunately, despite the administration's emphasis on the environment and climate, their recent actions contradict that and undermine their entire credibility. The biofuel industry has proven that ethanol reduces greenhouse gas emissions from motor fuel by almost half.

Almost every vehicle on the road can run on at least E10 ethanol. Many retailers are now selling more E15 ethanol and other higher blends like E85, if you have a vehicle that can use E85. Whether it is 10 percent, 15 percent, or 85 percent, it is cleaner than 100 percent petroleum.

According to the Energy Information Administration, by 2050, 81 percent of new vehicle sales will still be gas-powered or flex fuel.

In my introductory telephone conversation with EPA Administrator Regan, when he was nominated, he told me that biofuels are a major tool in the Biden administration's plan to combat climate change. I stressed to him at that time the importance of the biofuels industry to both agriculture and energy, and Iowa happens to be the No. 1 producer of ethanol.

No matter what the EPA or Big Oil says about the impact of its waivers to oil companies making billions in profits, farmers and biofuel producers know and feel the negative impact. Any attempt to exempt oil refiners from their biofuels obligation is a blatant bailout.

The law is simple: Blend biofuels or buy credits from those who do. By adding more biofuels to our energy mix, we can reduce emissions from dirty oil while keeping transportation costs low for working families.

Unfortunately, despite the administration's emphasis on environment, it seems like biofuels don't appear to be much of a priority and well short of what nominee at that time, now-EPA Director Regan said that it would be. Now it looks like labor unions have been co-opted by Big Oil, and we are doing their bidding in the White House.

President Biden is now faced with a decision. He can lower greenhouse gases with biofuels or he can side with Big Oil to destroy biofuel demand by illegally tampering with the renewable fuel standard, just as we had problems with previous administrations, both

Republican and Democratic—referring to what the Obama and Trump administrations did with the small refineries exemption.

Whether it is labor unions or Big Oil, I won't tire in standing up for home-grown clean biofuels. I did that whether we had Democratic or Republican administrations. I will continue to advocate for Iowans and the biofuels because it strengthens U.S. energy independence, makes for a cleaner environment, and creates jobs in rural America.

I encourage President Biden, EPA Administrator Regan, and my colleagues from across the aisle to keep it clean.

Does President Biden want to be known as "Big Oil" Biden? I don't think he does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. RES. 134

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, for more than 100 years, throughout times of change, tumult, and uncertainty, there has been a constant: the special relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom.

The UK has been one of our staunchest and most loyal allies. We have stood beside each other through two World Wars and the Cold War. In the 21st century, the United States and the United Kingdom have become even stronger friends and partners, both in the fight against global terrorism and for freedom, peace, and prosperity.

Now an opportunity lies before us to strengthen the relationship more than ever by securing a free-trade agreement between our two nations, which is the purpose of the resolution before us today. The trading relationship between our countries is already really strong. For hundreds of years, it has been a force for economic prosperity and security for us both.

In just 2019, the total trade in goods and services between our two countries totaled \$273 billion, and the United Kingdom was the seventh largest trading partner of the United States in goods. Figures from that same year show that U.S. trade with the United Kingdom resulted in a \$21.8 billion trade surplus.

The United States and the United Kingdom, in fact, share the single largest bilateral trade and investment relationship in the world. And now, with the UK's newfound ability to negotiate independent free-trade deals, we have the opportunity to grow that relationship even more.

A free-trade agreement would allow even more goods and services to flow even more easily between our two countries. It would allow for expanded commercial partnerships and greater investments in emerging industries. It would serve as an even greater engine of prosperity and economic liberty on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

This is a no-brainer, and it would be a tremendous asset in the midst of the economic and geopolitical challenges we face today. The pandemic and supply chain turmoil have proven that friends are invaluable in a pinch. While many global relationships have been unsteady and many governments don't know what their future trading relationships will look like, the United Kingdom has been a stalwart and secure partner with the United States.

Furthermore, it could not be a better move in the age of great power competition with China. We will not beat China by trying to be like China in imposing centralized command-and-control grips on the economy that will strangle trade and trample free enterprise. Instead, we should do what we have always done best: prioritize free, open, and fair commerce with friendly nations, as the G7 this past weekend confirmed.

At the conclusion of the summit, the group, as a whole, agreed to "secure our future prosperity by championing freer, fairer trade within a reformed trading system." And the United States and the United Kingdom signed a New Atlantic Charter in which both countries committed to take actions "enabling open and fair trade between nations."

Securing a mutually beneficial trade agreement with one of our oldest and closest allies would be in the best interest of us all. As President Biden himself recently said: "America's alliances are our greatest asset, and leading with diplomacy means standing shoulder-to-shoulder with our allies and key partners once again."

On this point, I could not agree with President Biden more. Congress can seize this opportunity by supporting the resolution before us today. It is a simple, straightforward resolution declaring the sense of the Senate that the United States has and should have a close and mutually beneficial trade relationship with the United Kingdom without interruption and that the President, with the support of Congress, should lay the groundwork for a future trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.

Borrowing a phrase from Prime Minister Boris Johnson, after his first face-to-face meeting with President Biden at the summit this past weekend, the United States-United Kingdom relationship is "indestructible." No two nations have worked more closely together. No two peoples have done more to expand and defend liberty or to achieve peace and prosperity.

Throughout history, this partnership has steadied the world through some of its greatest perils. It can continue to do so today if only we let it. The American and British peoples have the opportunity to once again join forces and emerge from the challenges we face stronger than ever for the benefit of our countries and nations across the globe. To that end, I urge each of my colleagues to support this resolution.

And I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration, and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 134. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, first, this resolution—and I am just going to make a few key points here—is on the trade agreement with the UK, and it is a question of international trade, which falls under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee.

The committee has not been consulted on the resolution so Senators have not had adequate time to consider it. Needless to say, the prospect of reshaping the American economy with sweeping trade deals is not something that should just rocket past the committee of jurisdiction.

Second, I have serious concerns about blessing a potential trade agreement with the United Kingdom when the contents of such an agreement are still unknown. I stated a number of times that there are serious issues that need consideration with respect to our economic relationship with the United Kingdom. That cannot happen if the debates play out in a slapdash process on the floor of the Senate.

For example, the United Kingdom has not only proposed but implemented a discriminatory digital service tax since entering negotiations with the United States. What they are doing is opportunistically looting American technology companies before these measures are shut down by an FTA or another agreement. The UK is also considering other discriminatory policies.

The UK must commit to abandoning these unfair policies, which are serious barriers to trade, a detriment to the special relationship, harmful to American workers, as a precondition of honest and worthwhile negotiations.

Otherwise, if Senators are going to rush to hand out big promises on trade talks, they risk surrendering America's negotiating position on these key issues without getting anything in return.

So I don't see the wisdom in undermining good-paying American jobs and American businesses with a trading partner that has thus far seen no reason to back away from discriminatory measures. For those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments and the insight provided by my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

As to the point regarding our relative negotiating power and the wisdom of approaching this task right now, it is important to remember this resolution doesn't purport to offer the details of

any such deal. It calls for a free-trade agreement. There is nothing surrendered by that. There is, however, a lot to be gained by that in signaling that we want to continue to have an open, free, and fair relationship with the United Kingdom.

As to the process concerns articulated by my friend and colleague, while he has expressed some concerns about the process, I must provide some evidence to the contrary.

Over the past year, my staff has communicated with the Senate Finance Committee staff, staff on both sides of the aisle, upward of half a dozen times. They have also pitched changes to assuage concerns about language multiple times but never received any definitive responses.

Furthermore, I have worked with colleagues on the other side of the aisle to craft almost identical draft language on United States-United Kingdom trade that was included in S. Res. 117, on the Good Friday Agreement, which passed before this body without objection. There is no reason why we can't reach a similar compromise on this legislation, and I stand ready and willing to work with my colleague from Oregon to do so.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to attend today's vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 119, Lina M. Khan, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted yea on confirmation. •

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL BRIAN S. EIFLER

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Mr. INHOFE, as the chair and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the co-chairs of the Senate Army Caucus, it is our honor to pay tribute to a great leader and an exceptional officer of the U.S. Army MG Brian S. Eifler, the chief of legislative liaison for the Office of the Secretary of the Army, as he prepares to leave this position for a new post in the Army of even greater importance to our Nation. Major General Eifler provides outstanding leadership, advice, and sound professional judgment on numerous critical issues of enduring importance to the Army, Congress, and this Nation.

Major General Eifler has served our Army and our Nation for more than 30 years. A native of Michigan, Major General Eifler was commissioned in 1990 as an infantry officer from Central Michigan University. He has been a true professional, dedicated soldier, leader, and officer. Throughout his career, he has commanded our great soldiers at many levels and deployed to